

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in light of the amendments and remarks herein.

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1–10 and 15–47 will be pending. By this amendment, claim 12 has been canceled; and claims 1, 15, 21, 27, 32, 38 and 44 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

§103 Rejection of Claims 1–10, 12 and 15–47

In Section 3 of the Final Office Action of November 20, 2006 (hereinafter referred to as “the Office Action”), claims 1–10, 12 and 15–47 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheah *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,788,953; hereinafter referred to as “Cheah”) and further in view of Michaelis *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 7,065,367; hereinafter referred to as “Michaelis”).

Embodiments of the present invention provide “methods and apparatus for implementing a phone system providing a local wireless connection and a wide area wireless connection. In one implementation, a terminal unit provides a wireless local loop interface to communicate with a cellular or PCS network and a cordless telephone interface to communicate with a cordless handset. A user places and receives calls through the cordless handset. The terminal unit interacts with the cordless handset and the cellular network to act as a pass through or intermediary device between the cordless handset and the public switched telephone network (PSTN).” *Specification, page 2, line 29 to page 3, line 2.*

Further, “[t]he terminal unit 200 also includes ... a user interface 265 including a

keypad (e.g., for number entry or a page button), ringer, and display....” *Specification, page 5, lines 24–28*. And, “[t]he terminal unit and handset also operate together to allow a user to enter commands to control the terminal unit through the handset and to control the handset through the terminal unit. ...in one implementation, each of the terminal unit and the handset include user interfaces for inputting commands and display information about the results of commands.” *Specification, page 8, lines 7–11* (emphasis added).

For example, the structure of a phone system of amended claim 1 comprises:

a terminal unit comprising:

a first antenna,
a first modem connected to said first antenna,

a second antenna,
a second modem connected to said second antenna,

a modem interface connected to said first modem and to
said second modem,

a terminal control block coupled to and operating together
with said first modem and said second modem to
effectively process and interpret commands received at
the terminal unit, and

a terminal user interface including *a keypad and a display,*
wherein a command is input using said keypad and
information about results of said command is displayed
on said display;

wherein said first modem provides a first air interface
using said first antenna for short range communication,

said second modem provides a second air interface using
said second antenna, and

said second air interface is different than said first air
interface. (emphasis added)

Accordingly, in one aspect of claim 1, the terminal unit of the phone system includes a terminal user interface including a keypad and a display, wherein a command is input using the keypad and information about results of the command is displayed on the display. See *Specification, page 5, lines 24–28, page 8, lines 7–11, and FIG. 2, 265.*

By contrast, the function mode manager of Cheah merely “monitors events from each system control module, such as the manager/controller, and makes basic mode transitions, controls dialing, etc..” *Cheah, Col. 8, lines 42–46.* Although the Office Action states that a terminal unit comprising a terminal interface is taught by the function mode manager 100 of Cheah, the function mode manager 100 does not include inputting a command using a keypad. Moreover, an integrated communication system 556 disclosed by Cheah is shown only with user interface elements consisting of LEDs 560, 562, 564 and a page button 566. See *Cheah, Col. 28, line 60 to Col. 29, line 18, and FIG. 27.* Cheah thus fails to disclose a terminal user interface including a keypad and a display, wherein a command is input using the keypad and information about results of the command is displayed on the display. Therefore, Cheah fails to teach or suggest all the limitations of amended claim 1, and it is submitted that claim 1 should be allowable over Cheah.

As to Michaelis, the Office Action states, “Michaelis teaches a terminal control block coupled to and operating together with said first modem and said second modem (modem controller 19 and processor 16 – figure 2, col. 5 line 50 – col. 6 line 16.” *Office Action, page 3, lines 12–14.* Even assuming that Michaelis discloses a control block coupled to and operating together with said first modem and said second modem, Michaelis fails to teach or suggest a terminal user interface including a keypad and a display, wherein a command is

input using the keypad and information about results of the command is displayed on the display. Therefore, since claim 1 should be allowable over Cheah as discussed above, Cheah and Michaelis, individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all the limitations of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 should be allowable over Cheah and Michaelis.

Based on the foregoing discussion regarding independent claim 1, and since amended independent claims 15, 21, 27, 32, 38, and 44 closely parallel and recite similar limitations as recited in claim 1, claims 15, 21, 27, 32, 38, and 44 should also be allowable over Cheah and Michaelis. Further, since claims 2–10, 16–20, 22–26, 28–31, 33–37, 39–43, and 45–47 depend from one of claims 1, 15, 21, 27, 32, 38, and 44, claims 2–10, 16–20, 22–26, 28–31, 33–37, 39–43, and 45–47 should also be allowable over Cheah and Michaelis. Claim 12 has been canceled by this amendment.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the rejection of claims 1–10, 12 and 15–47 based upon 35 U.S.C. §103(a) has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, applicants respectfully request reconsideration of claims 1–10 and 15–47 in view of the remarks and submit that all pending claims are presently in condition for allowance.

In the event that additional cooperation in this case may be helpful to complete its prosecution, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact Applicant's representative at the telephone number written below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 18, 2007

By: 

Samuel S. Lee
Reg. No. 42,791

Procopio, Cory, Hargreaves & Savitch LLP
530 B Street, Suite 2100
San Diego, California 92101-4469
(619) 525-3821